

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 through 22 in view of the above amendments and the following arguments.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The Applicants appreciate the telephone interview conducted March 2, 2005, between Examiner Wilson and the undersigned attorney. In the interview, the term "common substrate" was discussed in detail. No agreement was reached as to the allowability of the claims.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 5 was objected to due to an informality. Claim 5 has been amended to correct the claim dependency error. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to this claim.

OBJECTION TO ABSTRACT

The Examiner objected to the use of reference numbers in the abstract. The Applicants respectfully submit that the use of reference numerals in the abstract is not objectionable. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the abstract.

1 CLAIMS 1-5, 8, 11, AND 13-16 ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY ATAC

2 The Examiner rejected claims 1 through 5, 8, 11, and 13 through 16 under 35 U.S.C. §
3 102(b) as being anticipated by Atac et al. (U.S. patent No. 4,985,830, hereinafter referred to as
4 "Atac" or the "Atac reference"). The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not
5 anticipated by the Atac reference.

6 Claims 1 through 12

7 Claim 1 is directed to a communications bus connected between a source node and a
8 destination node, and requires the following limitations:

9 (a) a number of alternate transmission paths extending between the source node and
10 the destination node on a common substrate comprising a semiconductor chip;
11 (b) a source switching arrangement interposed between the source node and the
12 alternate transmission paths, the source switching arrangement being operable to
13 selectively connect the source node to a selected one of the alternate transmission
14 paths and disconnect the source node from each other alternate transmission path;
15 and
16 (c) a destination switching arrangement interposed between the destination node and
17 the alternate transmission paths, the destination switching arrangement being
18 operable to selectively connect the destination node to the selected one of the
19 alternate transmission paths and disconnect the destination node from each other
20 alternate transmission path.

21 Atac fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise disclose a communication bus including a
22 number of alternate transmission paths extending between the source node and the destination
23 node on a common substrate comprising a semiconductor chip. Rather, Atac discloses an
24 interprocessor bus switching system where a path is found for communications between
25 processors in the system. There is no teaching or suggestion in the Atac reference to include a
26 number of alternate transmission paths extending between the source node and the destination
27 node on a common semiconductor chip.

1 Because Atac does not teach or suggest each and every element required by claim 1, the
2 Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by the reference and is entitled to allowance
3 together with its dependent claims, including claims 2 through 4, 5, 8, and 11.

4 Claim 13 through 16

5 Claim 13 is directed to a communications bus connected between a number of source
6 nodes and an equal number of destination nodes. Among other elements, claim 13 requires a
7 number of alternate transmission paths extending between each respective source node and a
8 matched one of the destination nodes on a common substrate comprising a semiconductor chip.

9 As discussed above with reference to claim 1, nothing in the Atac reference teaches or suggests
10 multiple alternate transmission paths between nodes on a common semiconductor substrate.

11 Because Atac does not teach each element of the claim, it cannot anticipate claim 13. Claim 13
12 should therefore be in condition for allowance together with its dependent claims, including
13 claims 14 through 16.

14

15 CLAIMS 9-10 ARE NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF ATAC

16 The Examiner rejected claims 9 through 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being
17 unpatentable over Atac. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9 through 10 are not
18 obvious in view of Atac on the ground that Atac fails to teach or suggest a communication bus
19 including a number of alternate transmission paths on a common substrate comprising a
20 semiconductor chip as recited in independent claim 1, from which claims 9 and 10 both depend.

21 For this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections
22 to dependent claims 9 through 10.

1 CLAIM 6 IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER ATAC IN VIEW OF MOSTASHARI

2 The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atac
3 in view of Mostashari (U.S. patent No. 4,964,120). The Applicants respectfully submit that
4 claim 6 is not obvious in view of the proposed combination of Atac and Mostashari on the
5 ground that the proposed combination does not teach each and every limitation set forth in the
6 claim.

7 Even assuming for the sake of argument that there is some suggestion to combine the
8 Atac and Mostashari references, the combination would not teach or suggest a communications
9 bus that includes a number of alternate transmission paths extending between nodes on a
10 "common substrate comprising a semiconductor chip" as required in claim 1, the independent
11 claim from which claim 6 depends. As discussed above with reference to the §102 rejection of
12 claim 1, Atac does not disclose a number of alternate transmission paths extending between the
13 source node and the destination node on a common substrate comprising a semiconductor chip.
14 Mostashari does not make up for this deficiency in the primary reference. The redundant cable
15 arrangement disclosed in Mostashari applies to a local area network and has nothing to do with
16 transmission paths on any common substrate. Mostashari certainly does not suggest multiple
17 alternate transmission paths on a semiconductor chip. Because neither Atac nor Mostashari
18 teaches or suggests a number of alternate transmission paths between nodes on a common
19 semiconductor substrate, the combination of these references also cannot teach this element.

20 Because the proposed combination does not teach each and every limitation set forth in
21 the claim, the Applicants believe claim 6 is entitled to allowance.

22

1 CLAIMS 7, 12, AND 17 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER ATAC IN VIEW OF WANG

2 In rejecting claims 7, 12, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over
3 Atac in view of Wang (U.S. patent No. 6,188,271), the Examiner cited Atac as the primary
4 reference and Wang only for showing use of TRI state drivers. However, as discussed above
5 with reference to claim 1, Atac fails to teach or suggest a communication bus having multiple
6 alternate transmission paths extending between nodes on a "common substrate comprising a
7 semiconductor chip." Nothing in Wang makes up for this deficiency in the primary reference.
8 Because neither reference shows the number of alternate transmission paths extending between
9 the nodes on a common substrate comprising a semiconductor chip, the proposed combination
10 also cannot show this feature. The Applicants therefore believe that claims 7, 12, and 17 are not
11 obvious in view of Atac and Wang, and are entitled to allowance.

12

13 CLAIMS 18-22 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER MOSTASHARI

14 The Examiner rejected claims 18 through 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being
15 unpatentable over Mostashari. However, as discussed above, the Mostashari reference merely
16 discloses a redundant LAN cable arrangement. Nothing in the reference teaches or suggests a
17 method for a communications bus having alternate transmission paths between nodes on a
18 common substrate as required by independent claim 18 as amended. Because the Mostashari
19 reference does not teach or suggest every element required in claim 18, the Applicants
20 respectfully submit that claim 18 is not obvious in view of the Mostashari reference and is
21 entitled to allowance together with its dependent claims, claims 19 through 22.

1 CONCLUSION

2 For all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and
3 allowance of claims 1 through 22.

4 If any issue remains as to the allowability of these claims, or if a conference might
5 expedite allowance of the claims, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned attorney
6 prior to issuing a further action in this case.

7

8 Respectfully submitted,

9 THE CULBERTSON GROUP, P.C.

10

11 Dated: 5 May 2005

12 By: Russell C. Scott
13 Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124
14 Russell C. Scott, Reg. No. 43,103
15 Trevor Lind, Reg. No. 54,785
16 1114 Lost Creek Boulevard, Suite 420
17 Austin, Texas 78746
18 512-327-8932
19 ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS

20 CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

21 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (Fax
22 No. 703-872-9306) on May 5, 2005.

23 Russell C. Scott, Reg. No. 43,103 Russell C. Scott

24
25
26
27 1060_Response_OA_050210.wpd